

Minutes for Town of North Smithfield Planning Board

Kendall Dean School, 83 Green Street

Thursday, April 2, 2015

The Chair called the meeting to order at 7:00pm.

Roll Call: Present: Dinna Finnegan, Cynthia Roberts, Lucien Benoit, Scott Lentz, Dean Naylor, David Punchak, Gary Palardy. Also in attendance were Town Planner Robert Ericson, Assistant Planner Bobbi Moneghan and Town Solicitor David Iglioizzi.

Disclosure: This is where anyone can disclose potential conflicts on matters before the Planning Board. Ms. Roberts asked if she were to buy a Subaru from Anchor Subaru, would this be something she needed to disclose? Attorney Iglioizzi stated it would not be a violation, but it should be disclosed if Anchor Subaru appeared before the board.

Chairman Naylor stated that the Attorney General is offering a workshop on the Open Meetings Law, April 22, 2015. Attorney Iglioizzi stated that the meeting does not cover ethics. Chairman Naylor thought it would be very informative session; if anyone cared to attend, it starts at 5:30pm.

Minutes: The March 19, 2015 minutes were approved as corrected. Motion by Dr. Benoit, seconded by Mr. Palardy, with all in favor. (5 –

0)

Capital Budget Requests: Mr. Kopacz presented for the school department and made some changes to the Capital Budget. The budget did grow and he fully understands it may not all be approved. The Planning Board will be ranking the new budget items High, Medium and Low.

The LED lighting project is one of the items added to the budget that will lead to considerable savings on gym and parking area lighting. Chairman Naylor asked if Mr. Kopacz could give the Board a projection of savings. Mr. Kopacz stated the estimates projected savings are in the binder. Mr. Palardy said there should be clarification of payback versus savings. Mr. Punchak noted that there were maintenance savings as well. The School Department pays Constellation Energy \$0.07/kwh for electricity supply..

Ms. Finnegan asked if the lighting would have the same brightness. Mr. Kopacz said it will be brighter. Ms. Roberts asked if the cost was the same and how did they calculate it. Mr. Kopacz explained they calculated the bills from one year of previous bills. Ms. Roberts asked if they factored in a major increase. Mr. Kopacz stated the supply rates don't move for 1 year. The next annual rate will be \$0.076

Mr. Ericson explained that these are supplemental requests that were identified in the recent RGB architectural review, and they are not

covered by the bond. There is no firm date for the RIDE reimbursement and the reimbursement does not add money to bond.

Mr. Ericson noted that item #14 is not an eligible capital item. The Planning Board does not have perview over it. The cost of ceiling painting may be reimbursable.

Ms. Roberts asked if the cameras are related to safety (#11). Mr. Kopacz stated that there are cameras there now, and these would be additional to expand security. Mr. Kopacz monitors security.

Mr. Palardy asked for the reason for the additional camera requirement. Mr. Kopacz stated he needed more views for security.

The Planning Board rated the additions to the School Capital Budget as follows:

High School District LED lighting \$60,700

Low School NSHS interior railings 66,000

Low School NSHS class FR doors 10,500

Low School NSHS gym FR doors 18,000

Low School NSHS stairwell windows 18,000

Medium School NSES 5 new cameras 7,500

Medium School NSHS 16 new cameras 32,000

Mr. Lentz made a motion to accept the rankings, Mr. Palardy

seconded, all in favor (5-0)

Mr. Ericson said that Ray Pendergast, Director of Public Works and Park & Recreation has reported that winter was hard on the high school tennis courts and asked if the Board would consider using the \$150,000 allotted to fix Pacheco Park to repair the tennis courts instead. The Pacheco Park project was originally ranked Low. Dr. Benoit made a motion to rate the high school tennis courts Medium and Pacheco Park Low, Mr. Palardy seconded, all in favor (5-0).

Land Development & Subdivision Regulations: Mr. Ericson and Attorney Iglioizzi said they are writing a maintenance easement. The easement wouldn't be in the subdivision regulations but would be a backup document for conditional waivers. They are also working on a construction/maintenance agreement for common driveways. The proposed regulations state that every lot has its own driveway.

Mr. Lentz, stated there needs to be a better definition of a driveway and provided additional language for the Regulations.

Mr. Punchak pointed out arterial street is defined in two places, one stand alone and the other in the street classification section, causing a discrepancy. The stand alone definition of arterial will be removed.

Article 5.3 Cuts, sidewalks, Driveways and Pedestrian Rights of Way

In the existing Regulations, Item E in Article 5.3 states Existing

sidewalks shall not be lower at driveways except for eighteen (18') inches in from road edge. Mr. Palardy commented and the Board discussed that this statement is confusing and a diagram would help clarify the regulation.

Article 5.7 Standards for the Construction of Public Improvements.

(3) Miscellaneous Street Requirements (a) Street rights-of-way shall be fifty (50) feet in width for required 26' pavement widths and forty (40) feet for 22' pavement widths.

Dr. Benoit objected to this change stating that all street rights-of-ways should be 50 feet in width and the Planning Board can determine if the pavement width should be 22' or 26'. He said the width should remain the same in case of the need for road widening in the future. It was decided that this planned modification will not be made.

The next section, Minor residential streets shall have a paved width of thirty (30) twenty-six (26) feet.

Where the Planning Board finds that topography, soils and other factors allow natural swale drainage and

no curbing, twenty-two (22) feet may be allowed for cul-de-sacs serving no more than four (4) residential

dwelling. Dr. Benoit recommended removing the second sentence allowing for 22 foot road widths. This item is unresolved.

There are two section K entries: Fire Hydrants/Fire Protection Cistern; one will be removed.

Section 8. Violations and Penalties, corrected as discussed. Mr. Ericson explained that he and Atty Iglioizzi have more work to do on this item. Mr. Lentz suggested on item B, leave the word shall and remove the word suspected.

Section 9. Administration and Amendments, corrected as discussed. Mr. Ericson made changes to the sections to match the state law.

Comprehensive Plan Workshop: Ms. Moneghan discussed the Circulation element of the Comprehensive Plan, the way it is organized, and the goals and objectives. She explained that the previous Circulation Section of the Comprehensive Plan will be used but made current. The Plan will include what the Town has now and what we plan to have in the future. The Plan also includes a discussion of the RI Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP) and the state's transportation priorities. Ms. Moneghan would like the Board to read through the Circulation section and suggest changes.

Mr. Lentz stated we should include something in the Circulation section to include future growth of the roads.

Planning Update: Dr. Benoit asked when Walgreens was opening. Mr. Ericson stated he wrote the developer and has not heard back yet.

Mr. Ericson gave an update around Dowling Village. Kohls is not definite yet. The developer has two tenants that might be willing to

split the Kohls lot. The building behind Firestone will probably be a fitness gym. Instead of an office building, there will be an apartment complex like the 903 in Providence. Buffalo Wild Wings is under construction.

Adjournment:

10. Adjournment: Dr. Benoit moved that the Planning Board adjourn. Seconded by Mr. Palardy with all in favor (5-0). The meeting ended at 9:30 PM.

Submitted by Kris Fanning and Robert Ericson on April 16, 2015

Approved by the Planning Board May 21, 2015